

REMARKS

The last Office Action of September 26, 2007 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9, 15-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1-4, 9, 16-17, 20 have been amended. Claims 18, 19 have been canceled. Claims 21-23 have been added. No amendment to the specification has been made. No fee is due.

It is noted that the drawings are objected to because of applicant's failure to show the subject matter set forth in claims 18, 19. Claims 18, 19 have now been canceled so this rejection becomes moot.

Claims 1, 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 3,629,628 to Rank.

Claims 2-7, 9, 16, 17, 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rank in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,369,386 to Lurie et al.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rank in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,825,110 to Page.

Claims 18, 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rank in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,657,333 to Shoykhet et al.

In order to clearly distinguish the present invention from the applied prior art, applicant has amended claim 1 by more clearly setting forth the structure of the rotor pressure ring. More specifically, claim 1 sets forth the provision of a coolant leadthrough and a bore assembly to respectively communicate with axial bores of the laminated core arrangement. Independent claim 23 has been added to set forth the particular configuration of the two rotor pressure rings along the lines recited in claim 1 and in addition their relative disposition to one another.

Claim 21, dependent on claim 1, has been added to set forth a particular positional relationship between the rotor pressure rings. Support therefore can be found in paragraph [0032] of the instant specification. Claim 22 has been added to set forth the use of air as coolant. Support therefore can be found throughout the specification, e.g. in paragraphs [0007] and [0028].

The Rank reference describes a cooling arrangement for a squirrel cage rotor having end rings at opposite ends of the rotor core. As clearly shown in Fig. 2, the end rings have a solid structure and thus lack the provision of passageways for selective communication with bores, as set forth in claim 1.

The Lurie et al. reference describes an arrangement for liquid supply into the rotor of an electric machine. The element (18) which is shown in Figs. 5, 7, 8 and referred to by the Examiner relates to a sealing plate which is mounted inside a pressure chamber (cf. col. 5, lines 22-23). Apart from the fact that there would be no motivation to modify Rank with Lurie because of the different nature of an end plate for securement of a rotor core and a sealing plate inside the rotor for sealing purposes, the holes in the sealing plate, while shown, have not been described in the specification in any detail. Their purpose is thus unclear. In addition, claim 1 does not merely set forth the provision of random bores in the rotor pressure ring, but rather sets forth different bores for definite purposes, namely to connect to respective axial bores in the laminated core.

For the reasons set forth above, it is applicant's contention that neither Rank nor Lurie et al., nor a combination thereof teaches or suggests the features of the present invention, as recited in independent claims 1, 15, 22.

As for the rejection of the retained dependent claims, these claims depend on claim 1, share its presumably allowable features, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that these claims should also be allowed.

It should, however, be noted that claims 9, 20 are further considered allowable on their own merits as they recite other features of the invention neither taught nor suggested by the applied prior art. In rejecting claims 9 and 20, the Examiner merely made the conclusory statement that *"It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to arrange the two pressure rings to be disposed in a circumferentially offset relationship by a bore or a group of bores."* Applicant believes that this rejection is improper in the context of the present invention and requests a citation or an Examiner's affidavit that provides such citations. As stated by the Federal Circuit in *In re Lee*, 61 USPQ2d, 1434, 1435, "Common knowledge and common sense,

even if assumed to derive from the agency's expertise, do not substitute for authority when the law requires authority.". The Court also stated that "The Board's findings must be documented on the record.". In addition, applicant notes that the offset relationship is not intended to "*minimize leakages*", as the Examiner surmised but is provided to suitably deflect the coolant flow into or out of selected axial bores in the laminated core.

Applicant has also carefully scrutinized the further cited prior art and finds it without any relevance to the claims on file. It is thus felt that no specific discussion thereof is necessary.

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that all claims on file should be considered patentably differentiated over the art and should be allowed.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully requested that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. If the Examiner feels that it might be helpful in advancing this case by calling the undersigned, applicant would greatly appreciate such a telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Henry M. Feiereisen
Agent For Applicant
Reg. No: 31,084

Date: December 21, 2007
350 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4714
New York, N.Y. 10118
(212)244-5500
HMF:af